



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sirable. The important thing is to decide in each case whether a proposed term is within the grasp of the high-school pupil, and let the number of the terms take care of itself.

The committee has a hard task before it. Perhaps the most difficult part of its task will be to find a terminology that will be readily applicable to English, not because the grammar of English is more difficult or more complex than that of other languages, but because in America individualistic democracy has asserted itself in the writing of English grammars as well as in everything else. It will be difficult to harmonize the many discordant voices; but let us hope for the best.

---

## THE PROBLEM FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES: SPANISH

---

C. P. WAGNER  
The University of Michigan

---

The paper under discussion has made it evident how valuable the comparative method is in the study of syntax, as in any other branch of scientific work. At the same time it has shown that the prevailing ideas of the subjunctive are probably, in some cases, erroneous.

It would not be feasible for me to attempt here an examination of the extent to which the categories of the subjunctive proposed by Dr. Hale are applicable to the Spanish language. I am more concerned today with his assumption, which seems not to have been questioned by the other gentlemen who have spoken, that "every additional language he [the student] learns adds to his confusion." Does this not describe a condition which few of us had suspected? Most teachers would say, offhand, "The more languages he studies, the easier he finds language study."

The teacher of Spanish in a university would be painfully aware of confusion did it exist, since nearly all of his students have had two or more languages before attacking Spanish. The results of a canvass of my own class are as follows:

Out of forty-eight students, only one had studied no language before taking up Spanish, two were studying their second language, three their sixth, five their fifth, twelve their third, and twenty-four their fourth. One exceptional case had studied six languages before starting Spanish. These students were questioned carefully as to whether they had ever been conscious of any confusion regarding the subjunctive, at any time in their language work, due to the fact that different grammars called the same construction by different names, or explained it differently. Only four stated that they had been aware of such confusion. There is no reason to consider this situation at all unusual.

How is this condition of things to be reconciled with the concrete instances that Dr. Hale has given us of confusion in grammars? The answer is to be sought in an examination of the different types of grammars. The maker of a reference grammar, desiring to be rigidly scientific, and concerned in the part devoted to syntax with arranging constructions by families and species, is tempted to give each specimen a descriptive label. The maker of a beginner's book, interested in practical results, tries to present his material in such form that the student can *recognize and reproduce* the more obvious and important constructions. He does not strive for completeness, and does not ignore the part which repetition and feeling play in the process of recognition and reproduction. The examination of a number of practical grammars shows that rarely do the authors find it desirable to name such a construction as "the subjunctive of wish," for instance, or to refer all subjunctives to a group of metaphysical categories. It is true that those grammars in which this is done disagree as to the categories. It is interesting to note in this connection that the four students mentioned above, who were aware of confusion in their ideas of the subjunctive, traced their confusion to the use of grammars of this type.

---

## THE PROBLEM FROM THE STANDPOINT OF ENGLISH

---

F. N. SCOTT

The University of Michigan

---

Before coming to my proper subject, I shall ask permission to say just a few words upon the general philological question raised by Professor Hale's paper.

The distinction between the indicative forms on the one hand and the conglomerate of linguistic expedients on the other which may be called the imperative-optative-subjunctive-modal-auxiliary form-group does not in my opinion rest, in its origin, upon a categorical distinction between actuality and possibility, or between dependent and independent clauses, or between present attainment and anticipation, but it represents the survival of an earlier stage of language side by side with a later stage.

In its earliest form language, we may be sure, was the expression mainly of emotion. It was indeed nothing more than the vocal concomitant of fear, anger, desire for food, and the like primitive instincts—the result of stresses and strains incident to flight and fight. Its vocabulary was limited to cries of joy or pain, calls for help, imprecations, amatory appeals, and utterances of a similar character. It was, so to speak, a moody language, made up of commands, entreaties, longings, and the expressions of vagrant fancy.

With the development of the intellectual powers—the powers of analysis,